

Solving for tadpole coefficients in one-loop amplitudes

Ruth Britto^c, Bo Feng^{a,b}

^a*Center of Mathematical Science, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China*

^b*Division of Applied Mathematical and Theoretical Physics,
China Institute for Advanced Study,*

Central University of Finance and Economics, Beijing, 100081, China

^c*Institut de Physique Théorique, CEA/Saclay, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette-Cedex, France*

Abstract

One-loop amplitudes may be expanded in a basis of scalar integrals multiplied by rational coefficients. We relate the coefficient of the one-point integral to the coefficients of higher-point integrals, by considering the effects of introducing an additional, unphysical propagator, subject to certain conditions.

1. Introduction

One-loop scattering amplitudes may be expanded in a sum of scalar integrals [1, 2, 3] multiplied by rational coefficients. This expansion arises explicitly in typical computational approaches, reviewed for example in [4]. The coefficients may be derived directly by reduction of Feynman integrals [1, 2], or they may be sought as solutions to linear equations taken from various singular limits, such as unitarity cuts, in an on-shell formalism [5]. Within the second approach, the coefficients can be found by applying “generalized unitarity” multi-cuts [6, 7, 8]. Alternatively, since the master integrals are known explicitly and feature unique (poly)logarithms, they can also be distinguished by the usual unitarity cuts, which are double-cuts [9]. One way to do this is by rewriting the measure of the cut integral in spinor variables, and then applying the residue theorem [10].

This procedure of spinor integration has been carried out in generality for theories with at most scalar masses, and analytic expressions for the coefficients of the scalar pentagon/box, triangle, and bubble integrals have been given [11]. However, the tadpole coefficients are missing, simply because they are obviously free of cuts in physical channels. Our note addresses this point.

We find that we can solve for the tadpole coefficients in terms of the coefficients of higher-point integrals after introducing an auxiliary, unphysical propagator. The auxiliary loop integral then has two propagators, so we can apply unitarity cuts formally. The tadpole coefficient is accordingly related to the bubble coefficient of the auxiliary integral. Our result is a set of relations giving the tadpole coefficients in terms of the bubble coefficients of both the original and auxiliary integrals, and the triangle coefficients of the auxiliary integrals. It is interesting to consider whether this construction might have other applications.

To derive the relations between tadpole coefficients and the others, we make use of work of Ossola, Papadopoulos, and Pittau (OPP) [7], which gives the result of one-loop reduction at the *integrand* level, building upon analysis of their tensor structure [12]. In addition to the integrands for scalar boxes, triangles, bubbles, and tadpoles, there are a number of “spurious terms” which vanish after integration. The complete decomposition and classification given by OPP allows us to relate the original loop integral to the auxiliary integral including the unphysical propagator. We then derive relations among their respective coefficients, and identify conditions that almost completely decouple the effect of the unphysical propagator.

We note that on-shell approaches to loop amplitudes face important subtleties in seeking tadpole coefficients analytically. The operation of making a single cut relates an n -point loop amplitude to an $(n+2)$ -point tree level quantity, which should be considered as an off-shell current. These are the same starting points as in proposals to reconstruct full amplitudes entirely from single cuts [13, 14]. Another cut-free integral is the 0-mass scalar bubble. In this note, we assume that this contribution is known. For applications to physical

amplitudes using unitarity methods, it will be necessary to account for cuts of self-energy diagrams [8]. The procedure for finding massless bubble coefficients is not known in general, analytically, and merits further exploration; here, we will comment on the possibility of taking a limit of vanishing mass. Another proposal [15] is to fix the tadpole and massless bubble contributions by universal divergent behavior, once all other integral coefficients are known.

2. Relations among cuts and coefficients

We adopt the notation of OPP [7, 12]. The D -dimensional loop momentum is denoted by $\bar{q}$, whose 4-dimensional component is q . The denominator factors take the form $\bar{D}_i = (\bar{q} + p_i)^2 - M_i^2$, where $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. The tadpole of interest shall be associated to the factor with $i = 0$. We define $\tilde{\ell} = -q - p_0$. and $K_i \equiv p_0 - p_i$. Expanding the loop momentum variable into its four-dimensional component plus the remaining part $\tilde{q}$ satisfying $\tilde{q}^2 = -\mu^2$, the denominators can be rewritten as $\bar{D}_i = (\tilde{\ell} - K_i)^2 - M_i^2 - \mu^2$.

We are interested in the effect of including an *auxiliary* denominator factor, which we write as

$$\bar{D}_K = (\tilde{\ell} - K)^2 - M_K^2 - \mu^2. \quad [\text{K-prop}] \quad (1)$$

At this point, K and M_K^2 are variables unrelated to the physical amplitude. Later, they will be chosen subject to conditions that minimize the effect of this auxiliary factor.

The one-loop integrand is

$$I_{true} = \frac{N(q)}{D_0 D_1 \cdots D_{m-1}} \quad [\text{true-integrand}] \quad (2)$$

where, following [7], we use $N(q)$ to denote the numerator, which is a polynomial in q . We call the integrand I_{true} the “true” integrand to distinguish it from the “auxiliary” integrand, which we construct by inserting the auxiliary factor $\bar{D}_K$, as follows.

$$I_K = \frac{N(q)}{\bar{D}_K \bar{D}_0 \bar{D}_1 \cdots \bar{D}_{m-1}} \quad [\text{aux-integrand}] \quad (3)$$

Consider the single-propagator cut of the tadpole of interest. It is the result of eliminating the denominator factor $\bar{D}_0$ from the integrand:

$$A_{1-cut}^{\text{tree}} = \frac{N(q)}{\bar{D}_1 \cdots \bar{D}_{m-1}} \quad [\text{1-cut-amp}] \quad (4)$$

This integrand is the analog of the product of tree amplitudes $A_{\text{Left}}^{\text{tree}} A_{\text{Right}}^{\text{tree}}$ obtained from a standard unitarity cut. However, from a *single* cut, we obtain a tree amplitude at a singular point in phase space, since two external on-shell momenta are equal and opposite. This singularity can create difficulties that we do not address generally here. It is probably best considered as an off-shell current.

In the OPP method [7], the integrand is expanded in terms of the master integrals multiplied by their coefficients in the amplitude, plus additional “spurious terms” which vanish upon integration. The unintegrated expansion is

$$\begin{aligned} I_{true} = & \sum_i^{m-1} [a(i) + \tilde{a}(q; i)] I^{(i)} + \sum_{i < j}^{m-1} [b(i, j) + \tilde{b}(q; i, j)] I^{(i, j)} + \sum_{i < j < r}^{m-1} [c(i, j, r) + \tilde{c}(q; i, j, r)] I^{(i, j, r)} \\ & + \sum_{i < j < r < s}^{m-1} [d(i, j, r, s) + \tilde{d}(q; i, j, r, s)] I^{(i, j, r, s)} + \sum_{i < j < r < s < t}^{m-1} e(i, j, r, s, t) I^{(i, j, r, s, t)} \quad [\text{true-opp-expansion}] \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $a(i), b(i, j), c(i, j, r), d(i, j, r, s), e(i, j, r, s, t)$ are the coefficients of the master integrals; $\tilde{a}(q; i), \tilde{b}(q; i, j), \tilde{c}(q; i, j, r), \tilde{d}(q; i, j, r, s)$ are the spurious terms which integrate to zero; and the master integrals are

$$I^{(i)} = \frac{1}{\bar{D}_i}, \quad I^{(i, j)} = \frac{1}{\bar{D}_i \bar{D}_j}, \quad I^{(i, j, r)} = \frac{1}{\bar{D}_i \bar{D}_j \bar{D}_r}, \quad I^{(i, j, r, s)} = \frac{1}{\bar{D}_i \bar{D}_j \bar{D}_r \bar{D}_s}, \quad I^{(i, j, r, s, t)} = \frac{1}{\bar{D}_i \bar{D}_j \bar{D}_r \bar{D}_s \bar{D}_t}.$$

Notice that we have included the pentagon explicitly. We shall perform our analysis of the coefficients in $D = 4 - 2\epsilon$ dimensions.

Now, consider the auxiliary integrand I_K . On one hand, it is simply the true integrand divided by the auxiliary propagator. Thus, using (5), we get the following expansion in master integrals:

$$I_K = \frac{I_{true}}{\bar{D}_K} = \sum_i^{m-1} [a(i) + \tilde{a}(q; i)] I^{(K, i)} + \sum_{i < j}^{m-1} [b(i, j) + \tilde{b}(q; i, j)] I^{(K, i, j)} + \sum_{i < j < r}^{m-1} [c(i, j, r) + \tilde{c}(q; i, j, r)] I^{(K, i, j, r)} \\ + \sum_{i < j < r < s}^{m-1} [d(i, j, r, s) + \tilde{d}(q; i, j, r, s)] I^{(K, i, j, r, s)} + \sum_{i < j < r < s < t}^{m-1} e(i, j, r, s, t) I^{(K, i, j, r, s, t)} \quad [\text{divided}] \quad (6)$$

Notice here that the “spurious” terms such as $\int \tilde{b}(q; i, j)$ are no longer spurious with the factor $\bar{D}_K$ included. For example, while $\int \tilde{b}(q; i, j) I^{(i, j)} = 0$ by construction, in general $\int \tilde{b}(q; i, j) I^{(K, i, j)} \neq 0$. On the other hand, the auxiliary integrand I_K has its own OPP expansion, where we label the auxiliary coefficients and spurious terms by the subscript K , and we separate the auxiliary propagator explicitly, so it is not included in the summation indices:

$$I_K = \sum_i^{m-1} [a_K(i) + \tilde{a}_K(q; i)] I^{(i)} + \sum_{i < j}^{m-1} [b_K(i, j) + \tilde{b}_K(q; i, j)] I^{(i, j)} + \sum_{i < j < r}^{m-1} [c_K(i, j, r) + \tilde{c}_K(q; i, j, r)] I^{(i, j, r)} \\ + \sum_{i < j < r < s}^{m-1} [d_K(i, j, r, s) + \tilde{d}_K(q; i, j, r, s)] I^{(i, j, r, s)} + \sum_{i < j < r < s, t}^{m-1} e_K(i, j, r, s, t) I^{(i, j, r, s, t)} \\ + [a_K(K) + \tilde{a}_K(q; K)] I^{(K)} + \sum_j^{m-1} [b_K(K, j) + \tilde{b}_K(q; K, j)] I^{(K, j)} + \sum_{j < r}^{m-1} [c_K(K, j, r) + \tilde{c}_K(q; K, j, r)] I^{(K, j, r)} \\ + \sum_{j < r < s}^{m-1} [d_K(K, j, r, s) + \tilde{d}_K(q; K, j, r, s)] I^{(K, j, r, s)} + \sum_{j < r < s, t}^{m-1} e_K(K, j, r, s, t) I^{(K, j, r, s, t)} \quad [\text{aux-opp}] \quad (7)$$

With the subscript K , terms such as $\tilde{b}_K(q; i, j)$ and $\tilde{b}_K(q; K, j)$ are truly spurious terms in (6), e.g. $\int \tilde{b}_K(q; K, j, r) I^{(K, j)} = 0$.

The purpose of introducing the auxiliary integrand I_K is to give information about the tadpole coefficient by cutting *two* propagators. So, we will always choose to cut the auxiliary propagator $\bar{D}_K$ along with $\bar{D}_0$. Restricted to the terms involved in this cut, the auxiliary integrand (7) is

$$I_K|_{C_{0K}} = [b_K(K, 0) + \tilde{b}_K(q; K, 0)] I^{(K, 0)} + \sum_i^{m-1} [c_K(K, 0, i) + \tilde{c}_K(q; K, 0, i)] I^{(K, 0, i)} \\ + \sum_{i < j}^{m-1} [d_K(K, 0, i, j) + \tilde{d}_K(q; K, 0, i, j)] I^{(K, 0, i, j)} + \sum_{i < j < s}^{m-1} e_K(K, 0, i, j, s) I^{(K, 0, i, j, s)} \quad [\text{aux-opp-restricted}] \quad (8)$$

Similarly, we can restrict our attention to the corresponding subset of terms in (6):

$$I_K|_{C_{0K}} = [a(0) + \tilde{a}(q; 0)] I^{(K, 0)} + \sum_i^{m-1} [b(0, i) + \tilde{b}(q; 0, i)] I^{(K, 0, i)} + \sum_{i < j}^{m-1} [c(0, i, j) + \tilde{c}(q; 0, i, j)] I^{(K, 0, i, j)} \\ + \sum_{i < j < r}^{m-1} [d(0, i, j, r) + \tilde{d}(q; 0, i, j, r)] I^{(K, 0, i, j, r)} + \sum_{i < j < r < s}^{m-1} e(0, i, j, r, s) I^{(K, 0, i, j, r, s)} \quad [\text{divided-restricted}] \quad (9)$$

Our plan is to find the tadpole coefficient, $a(0)$, by imposing the equivalence of (8) and (9) *after* completing the cut integral. After integration, the spurious terms of (8) simply drop out, as they are designed

to do so:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{C_{0K}} I_K &= b_K(K, 0) \int_{C_{0K}} I^{(K,0)} + \sum_i^{m-1} c_K(K, 0, i) \int_{C_{0K}} I^{(K,0,i)} \\ &+ \sum_{i < j}^{m-1} d_K(K, 0, i, j) \int_{C_{0K}} I^{(K,0,i,j)} + \sum_{i < j < s}^{m-1} e_K(K, 0, i, j, s) \int_{C_{0K}} I^{(K,0,i,j,s)} \quad [\text{int-aux-opp-restricted}] \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here, the cut integral is denoted by $\int_{C_{0K}}$, which indicates that we use the Lorentz-invariant phase space measure including the factor $\delta(\bar{D}_0)\delta(\bar{D}_K)$.

However, the integration of the formula (9) is not so straightforward, because the original spurious terms no longer correspond to the structures of the denominators they multiply. So, we shall view the expression (9) as a function of the loop momentum q , and find the coefficients of master integrals analytically, for each of the spurious terms classified by OPP.

Keeping in mind that our target is the single number $a(0)$, which appears as part of the auxiliary bubble coefficient in (9), we begin by extracting only the auxiliary bubble contributions of the various spurious terms, divided by their denominators as well as $\bar{D}_K$. (The other non-spurious terms, with $b(0, i)$, $c(0, i, j)$, and $d(0, i, j, r)$, clearly belong entirely to coefficients of other master integrals, of which the 4-dimensional pentagon is a linear combination of five boxes.)

Our result is that there are conditions under which most of the spurious terms have no effect. Specifically, for all the propagator momenta K_i inside $\bar{D}_i$, we would like to take

$$K \cdot K_i = 0, \quad \forall i; \quad M_K^2 = M_0^2 + K^2. \quad [\text{KM-cond}] \quad (11)$$

We are free to take (11) as a definition of M_K^2 , while the condition for K is clearly nontrivial to satisfy physically. Let us consider this condition more concretely. For the purposes of defining our construction, we perform a formal reduction. Any integrand having five or more propagators has at least four independent momenta K_i that can be used to expand any external momentum vector appearing in the numerator to do the reduction. For integrands with at most four propagators, there are no more than three momenta K_i , and the condition (11) can be satisfied, for example by the construction $K_\mu = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} K_1^\nu K_2^\rho K_3^\sigma$.

If conditions (11) are satisfied, then we find that only one of all the spurious terms contributes to the auxiliary bubble coefficient. Specifically,

$$b_K(K, 0) = a(0) + \frac{1}{12} \sum_i (K_i^2 - M_i^2 + M_0^2) \tilde{b}_{00}[K_i], \quad (12)$$

where $\tilde{b}_{00}[K_i]$ is the coefficient of one of the spurious terms defined in [7].

A convenient way to constrain $\tilde{b}_{00}[K_i]$ is to identify the effect of the spurious term on the auxiliary triangle coefficient. Still imposing the conditions (11), we *repeat* our analysis of all the OPP spurious terms in (9), this time isolating the contributions to *triangle* coefficients. Fortunately, we find that only this same single spurious term has a nonvanishing effect, if we focus on the terms with μ^2 -dependence. (We assume that explicit μ^2 -dependence in the numerator $N(q)$ has been set aside.) The result is

$$c_K(K, 0, i)|_{\mu^2} = b(0, i)|_{\mu^2} + \frac{K_i^2}{3} \tilde{b}_{00}[K_i], \quad (13)$$

where $|_{\mu^2}$ means the coefficient of μ^2 .

Now we propose the following procedure for finding tadpole coefficients.

1. Find the single-cut expression A_{1-cut}^{tree} obtained by cutting the propagator $\bar{D}_0$. Expand the numerator in μ^2 , and work term by term, setting aside these explicit factors of μ^2 .
2. Construct the true integrand $I = A_{1-cut}^{\text{tree}}/\bar{D}_0$ and the auxiliary integrand $I_K = A_{1-cut}^{\text{tree}}/(\bar{D}_K \bar{D}_0)$. It may be convenient at this stage already to choose K and M_K to satisfy the conditions (11). Alternatively, they can be taken as arbitrary variables until the final step.

3. Use the cut integral $\int_{C_{0K}} I_K$ to evaluate the auxiliary bubble coefficient $b_K(K, 0)$ and all the auxiliary triangle coefficients $c_K(K, 0, i)$.
4. Use the cut integrals $\int_{C_{0K_i}} I$ to evaluate all the true bubble coefficients $b(0, i)$.
5. The tadpole coefficient is given by imposing the conditions (11) in the following expression.

$$a(0) = b_K(K, 0) + \sum_i \frac{K_i^2 - M_i^2 + M_0^2}{4K_i^2} [c_K(K, 0, i) - b(0, i)]_{\mu^2}. \quad (14)$$

This formula is valid term by term, having set aside the original explicit factors of μ^2 in the numerator $N(q)$.

3. Contributions to $b_K(K, 0)$ from spurious terms

In this section we will discuss the contributions to $b_K(K, 0)$ of the auxiliary integrand I_K from the expression (9), where the terms have been separated into the scalar integral coefficients, plus spurious terms as classified by OPP [7]. As we have discussed, these terms are no longer “spurious” in the same sense, once $\bar{D}_K$ is included. (N.B.: OPP write the expansion with all denominators multiplied through, so that the “spurious terms” for them are the polynomial numerators. Here, we use “auxiliary spurious terms” to refer to the corresponding terms with all denominators present, including $\bar{D}_K$.)

The first contribution is obviously $a(0)$, which is the tadpole coefficient that interests us. Now we discuss the possible contributions from the terms with $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{c}, \tilde{d}$ in (9). We will see why we choose the decoupling conditions (11). They arise naturally by considering the terms of lowest degree. We have proceeded step by step through all the spurious terms of [7]. Our results have been derived in the formalism of [10] and verified using Passarino-Veltman reduction [1] as implemented in FeynCalc [16].

- **One-point spurious terms:** In the simplest case, all spurious terms of this type are linear in the numerator $I_{11} = 2\tilde{\ell} \cdot R_1 / \bar{D}_0$. The auxiliary integrand, including $\bar{D}_K$ in the denominator, is then $I_{11}^{\bar{D}_K} = 2\tilde{\ell} \cdot R_1 / (\bar{D}_K \bar{D}_0)$. It is easy to find the scalar bubble coefficient from a standard unitarity cut (or alternatively, by straightforward reduction). The result is

$$C[\bar{D}_0, \bar{D}_K] = \frac{(K \cdot R_1)(K^2 + M_0^2 - M_K^2)}{K^2}. \quad [\text{I11-D0DK}] \quad (15)$$

There are four independent “1-point like” spurious terms as given by OPP, i.e., four independent values of R_1 . We see that we can decouple all their contributions by imposing the condition

$$K^2 + M_0^2 - M_K^2 = 0 \quad [\text{alpha}=0] \quad (16)$$

- **Two-point spurious terms:** Spurious 2-point terms can be either linear or quadratic in loop momentum. In the case of linear dependence, the auxiliary integrand with $\bar{D}_K$ has the scalar bubble coefficient

$$C[\bar{D}_0, \bar{D}_K] = \frac{-(K \cdot K_i)(K \cdot R_1) + K^2(K_i \cdot R_1)}{(K \cdot K_i)^2 - K^2 K_i^2}. \quad [\text{I21-D0DK}] \quad (17)$$

In the spurious terms, R_1 takes three possible values of vectors, called ℓ_7, ℓ_8, n . These vectors are defined in [7]; here we only need to use some of their properties. (We use K as the auxiliary momentum in the OPP construction of these vectors.) In each of these cases, we have $R_1 \cdot K_i = 0$. Moreover, $K \cdot \ell_{7/8} = 0$, but $K \cdot n \neq 0$. To make this last spurious contribution vanish, we enforce a new decoupling condition:

$$K \cdot K_i = 0. \quad [\text{KK1}=0] \quad (18)$$

Now we move on to the quadratic spurious 2-point terms. There are five such terms. For four of them, the auxiliary bubble coefficient vanishes under the two decoupling conditions. The fifth spurious term is $K(q; 0, i)$, which can be written $(\tilde{\ell} \cdot n)^2 - ((\tilde{\ell} \cdot K_i)^2 - K_i^2 \tilde{\ell}^2)/3$. Its coefficient in the OPP expansion is denoted $\tilde{b}_{00}(0, i)$. After imposing the decoupling conditions, the auxiliary bubble coefficient from this term is

$$C_{\tilde{b}_{00}(0, i)} = \frac{K_i^2 + M_0^2 - M_i^2}{12}. \quad (19)$$

Because this spurious term gives a nonzero contribution under the decoupling conditions, we must calculate it and subtract its contribution when we calculate the tadpole coefficient. For this reason, we will turn to the auxiliary triangles $c_K(K, 0, i)$ in the following section.

- **Three-point and four-point spurious terms:** All of the auxiliary three-point spurious terms decouple after imposing (11). There is just one auxiliary four-point spurious term, and it gives no bubble contribution at all, because its numerator is linear in the loop momentum.

To summarize, have seen that if we impose the conditions (11), then all contributions from spurious terms will decouple, except one, whose coefficient is $\tilde{b}_{00}$. We have

$$b_K(K, 0) = a(0) + \sum_i \tilde{b}_{00}(0, i) \frac{K_i^2 + M_0^2 - M_i^2}{12} \quad [\text{a0-eq-1}] \quad (20)$$

where $\tilde{b}_{00}(0, i)$ is the coefficient of the spurious term $K(q; 0, i)$ as defined by OPP.

In this analysis, we are assuming a renormalizable theory. We have assumed that the power of $\tilde{\ell}$ in the numerator is equal to or less than the number of propagators in the denominator. In those terms where the power of $\tilde{\ell}$ is *strictly* less than the number of propagators, then we have $\tilde{b}_{00}(0, i) = 0$, $\forall i$. Thus we have $b_K(K, 0) = a(0)$, i.e., we get the tadpole coefficient $a(0)$ immediately by calculating the bubble coefficient under the decoupling conditions. From terms where the power of $\tilde{\ell}$ is equal to the number of propagators, $\tilde{b}_{00}(0, i) \neq 0$, and we need to compute it. We have found that we can use a similar decoupling approach to calculate the triangle coefficient $C[\bar{D}_0, \bar{D}_K, \bar{D}_i]$ and extract the corresponding $\tilde{b}_{00}(0, i)$. This procedure will be discussed in the next section.

4. The calculation of $\tilde{b}_{00}(0, i)$

Recall the expansion (9), where we augmented the OPP expansion with the extra factor $\bar{D}_K$, so that the spurious terms no longer integrate to zero. We see that the term $\tilde{b}(q; 0, i) I^{(K, 0, i)}$ contributes not only to the coefficient of the bubble $I^{(K, 0)}$, but also to the coefficient of the triangle $I^{(K, 0, i)}$. Thus it is possible to find $\tilde{b}_{00}(0, j)$ from the evaluation of the coefficient of triangle $I^{(K, 0, i)}$ within $I_K|_{C_{0K}}$.

Just as in the previous section, where we studied all contributions to coefficient of $I^{(K, 0)}$ from $I_K|_{C_{0K}}$, so $c_K(K, 0, i)$ in (8) also receives contributions from the original spurious terms in (9). Thus we carry out the corresponding analysis in this section. We impose the decoupling conditions from the start. Then we find that three of the auxiliary spurious terms still give auxiliary triangle contributions. The first nonvanishing contribution comes, indeed, from the term we want, namely $K(q; 0, i)$. Its auxiliary triangle contribution, after having applied the decoupling conditions, is

$$C[\bar{D}_0, \bar{D}_K, \bar{D}_i]_{\tilde{b}_{00}} = -\frac{(K_1^2 + M_0^2 - M_i^2)^2 - 4K_i^2(M_0^2 + \mu^2)}{12}. \quad [\text{tri-22}] \quad (21)$$

The second and third nonvanishing contributions come from the spurious 3-point terms with quadratic dependence on the loop momentum. The auxiliary integrand is

$$I_{32}^{\bar{D}_K} = \frac{(2\tilde{\ell} \cdot R_1)^2}{\bar{D}_0 \bar{D}_K \bar{D}_i \bar{D}_j}, \quad (22)$$

6

where R_1 takes two values, called $\ell_{3,4}$. After applying the decoupling conditions, we find that the triangle coefficient is

$$-\frac{(K \cdot R_1)^2((K_i \cdot K_j)(K_i^2 + M_0^2 - M_i^2) - K_i^2(K_j^2 + M_0^2 - M_j^2))}{K^2((K_i \cdot K_j)^2 - K_i^2 K_j^2)}$$

This quantity does not vanish identically, so our decoupling might seem to be inadequate. But there is good news here: *the contribution does not depend on μ^2* , while the contribution from b_{00} does depend on μ^2 . Thus we can use the μ^2 -dependence to find exactly the term we need.

Our plan is now clear: (1) calculate the bubble coefficient $b(0, i)$ from the integrand I_{true} , which does not contain $\bar{D}_K$; (2) calculate the triangle coefficient $c_K(K, 0, i) \equiv C[\bar{D}_0, \bar{D}_K, \bar{D}_i]$ of the integrand I_K , which does contain $\bar{D}_K$; (3) find the μ^2 -dependent terms in $b(0, i)$ and $c_K(K, 0, i)$, and then solve the following equation to find $\tilde{b}_{00}(0, i)$.

$$c_K(K, 0, i)|_{\mu^2} = b(0, i)|_{\mu^2} + \frac{K_i^2}{3} \tilde{b}_{00}(0, i), \quad [c-K-i] \quad (23)$$

where $|_{\mu^2}$ means the coefficient of μ^2 . After computing $\tilde{b}_{00}(0, i)$ for every i , we substitute back into (20) and finally find $a(0)$, the tadpole coefficient.

5. Examples and discussion

Finally, we list some formulas we obtained from our algorithm and comment on their properties. We denote a general integrand term by two indices n, m , writing $I_{n,m}[\{K_i\}, \{R_j\}] = \prod_{j=1}^m (2\tilde{\ell} \cdot R_j) / (\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \bar{D}_i)$. Further, we define $\alpha_i = K_i^2 + M_0^2 - M_i^2$ and $\Delta_{ij} = (K_i \cdot K_j)^2 - K_i^2 K_j^2$. The tadpole coefficients from the first few of these integrands are:

$$a[\bar{D}_0]_{I_{21}} = \frac{-R_1 \cdot K_1}{K_1^2} \quad [I_{21}\text{-tad}] \quad (24)$$

$$a[\bar{D}_0]_{I_{22}} = -\frac{\alpha_1[(R_1 \cdot R_2)K_1^2 - 4(R_1 \cdot K_1)(R_2 \cdot K_1)]}{3(K_1^2)^2} \quad [I_{22}\text{-tad}] \quad (25)$$

$$a[\bar{D}_0]_{I_{32}} = \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^2 A_{ij}(K_i \cdot R_1)(K_j \cdot R_2)}{K_1^2 K_2^2 \Delta_{12}}, \quad (26)$$

where

$$A_{11} = K_2^2(K_1 \cdot K_2), \quad A_{22} = K_1^2(K_1 \cdot K_2), \quad A_{12} = A_{21} = -K_1^2 K_2^2 \quad [I_{32}\text{-tad}] \quad (27)$$

$$a[\bar{D}_0]_{I_{33}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{j \leq k} A_{i,j,s}(K_i \cdot R_2)(K_j \cdot R_1)(K_s \cdot R_1)}{3(K_1^2 K_2^2)^2 \Delta_{12}^2}, \quad [I_{33}\text{-tad}] \quad (28)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{1;11} &= -2(K_2^2)^2(\Delta_{12}(4\alpha_1(K_1 \cdot K_2) - 2\alpha_2 K_1^2) + 5K_1^2(K_1 \cdot K_2)(\alpha_2(K_1 \cdot K_2) - \alpha_1 K_2^2)) \\ A_{2;11} &= A_{1;12} = -2K_1^2(K_2^2)^2(\alpha_1 \Delta_{12} - 5K_1^2(\alpha_2(K_1 \cdot K_2) - \alpha_1 K_2^2)), \\ A_{2;22} &= A_{1;11}|_{\alpha_1, K_1 \leftrightarrow \alpha_2, K_2}, \quad A_{2;12} = A_{1;22} = A_{1;12}|_{\alpha_1, K_1 \leftrightarrow \alpha_2, K_2} \end{aligned}$$

$$a[\bar{D}_0]_{I_{43}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{t \leq s, 1}^3 A_{i;ts}(K_i \cdot R_2)(K_t \cdot R_1)(K_s \cdot R_1)}{K_1^2 K_2^2 K_3^2 \Delta_{12} \Delta_{13} \Delta_{23} \Delta_{123}}, \quad (29)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{123} &= K_1^2 K_2^2 K_3^2 + 2(K_1 \cdot K_2)(K_2 \cdot K_3)(K_3 \cdot K_1) - K_1^2(K_2 \cdot K_3)^2 - K_2^2(K_1 \cdot K_3)^2 - K_3^2(K_1 \cdot K_2)^2 \\
A_{1;11} &= 2\Delta_{23} K_2^2 K_3^2 \{ (K_2 \cdot K_3)[(K_1 \cdot K_2)^2 \Delta_{13} + (K_1 \cdot K_3)^2 \Delta_{12}] + (K_1 \cdot K_2)(K_1 \cdot K_3)[K_2^2 \Delta_{13} + K_3^2 \Delta_{12}] \} \\
A_{1;12} &= A_{2;11} = 2K_1^2 K_2^2 K_3^2 \Delta_{13} \Delta_{23} (-K_2^2(K_1 \cdot K_3) + (K_2 \cdot K_1)(K_2 \cdot K_3)), \quad A_{1;13} = A_{3;11} = [A_{1;12}]|_{K_2 \leftrightarrow K_3}, \\
A_{2;22} &= [A_{1;11}]|_{K_1 \leftrightarrow K_2}, \quad A_{3;33} = [A_{1;11}]|_{K_1 \leftrightarrow K_3}, \quad A_{3;23} = A_{2;33} = [A_{1;12}]|_{K_1 \leftrightarrow K_3}, \quad A_{2;12} = A_{1;22} = [A_{1;12}]|_{K_1 \leftrightarrow K_2}, \\
A_{2;23} &= A_{3;22} = [A_{1;12}]|_{K_1, K_2, K_3 \rightarrow K_2, K_3, K_1}, \quad A_{3;13} = A_{1;33} = [A_{1;12}]|_{K_1, K_2, K_3 \rightarrow K_3, K_1, K_2}, \\
A_{1;23} &= A_{2;13} = A_{3;12} = -2K_1^2 K_2^2 K_3^2 \Delta_{12} \Delta_{13} \Delta_{23}
\end{aligned}$$

We note some patterns in these tadpole coefficients: (1) the tadpole coefficient is independent of μ^2 ; (2) for $I_{n,n-1}$, the coefficient is independent of masses; (3) for $I_{n,n}$, the coefficient is of the form $\sum_i \alpha_i c_i$.

Finally, we offer a comment on massless limits. In our calculation, we have assumed that $K_i^2 \neq 0$. What happens when $K_i^2 \rightarrow 0$? Let us use I_{21} as an example. The full reduction of I_{21} is

$$I_{21} = (R_1 \cdot K_1) \left(1 + \frac{M_0^2 - M_1^2}{K_1^2} \right) I_{2,0} - \frac{R_1 \cdot K_1}{K_1^2} I_{1,0}[\bar{D}_0] + \frac{R_1 \cdot K_1}{K_1^2} I_{1,0}[\bar{D}_1]. \quad [\text{Exn-1-final}] \quad (30)$$

Using the expressions for the scalar integrals,

$$I_2^D(K_1^2 = 0; M_1^2, M_2^2) = \frac{\mu^{2\epsilon} \Gamma(\epsilon)}{r_\Gamma} \frac{(M_0^2 - i\varepsilon)^{1-\epsilon} - (M_2^2 - i\varepsilon)^{1-\epsilon}}{(1-\epsilon)(M_0^2 - M_2^2)}, \quad I_{1,0} = \mu^{2\epsilon} \frac{\Gamma(-1+\epsilon)}{r_\Gamma} (M_0^2 - i\varepsilon)^{1-\epsilon}, \quad (31)$$

it is easy to see that the term with $1/K_1^2$ will be canceled exactly on the right hand side of $I_{2,1}$. That is, for $I_{2,1}$, knowing the coefficient of the bubble, the smoothness of the limit $K_1^2 \rightarrow 0$ is enough to fix the tadpole coefficient. Does this pattern hold in general? Looking back through our examples, we see that for I_{32}, I_{33} , and I_{43} , the limits $K_1^2, K_2^2 \rightarrow 0$ give divergences which should be cancelled elsewhere. It is not yet clear exactly how generally we can relate the bubble coefficients to various tadpole coefficients by considering smoothness requirements in various limits, although the general behavior of M^2 dependence suggests that such relations should exist.

Acknowledgments

We thank the participants of the *International workshop on gauge and string amplitudes* at IPPP Durham, where this work has been presented. The work of R.B. was supported by Stichting FOM; by Fermilab, which is operated by Fermi Research Alliance, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11359 with the United States Department of Energy; and by the DSM CEA-Saclay. B.F. would like to thank the CUFE for hospitality while the final part was done. His work is supported by Qiu-Shi funding from Zhejiang University and Chinese NSF funding under contract No.10875104.

References

- [1] G. Passarino and M. J. G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **160**, 151 (1979).
- [2] W. L. van Neerven and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Phys. Lett. B **137**, 241 (1984);
Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Phys. Lett. B **302**, 299 (1993) [Erratum-ibid. B **318**, 649 (1993)] [hep-ph/9212308];
Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B **412**, 751 (1994) [hep-ph/9306240].
- [3] L. M. Brown and R. P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. **85**, 231 (1952);
D. B. Melrose, Nuovo Cim. **40**, 181 (1965);
G. 't Hooft and M. J. G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **153**, 365 (1979);
R. G. Stuart, Comput. Phys. Commun. **48**, 367 (1988);
R. G. Stuart and A. Gongora, Comput. Phys. Commun. **56**, 337 (1990);
G. J. van Oldenborgh and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Z. Phys. C **46**, 425 (1990);
J. Fleischer, F. Jegerlehner and O. V. Tarasov, Nucl. Phys. B **566**, 423 (2000) [hep-ph/9907327];
T. Binoth, J. P. Guillet and G. Heinrich, Nucl. Phys. B **572**, 361 (2000) [hep-ph/9911342];
A. Denner and S. Dittmaier, Nucl. Phys. B **658**, 175 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0212259];
G. Duplancić and B. Nizić, Eur. Phys. J. C **35**, 105 (2004) [hep-ph/0303184];
A. Denner and S. Dittmaier, Nucl. Phys. B **734**, 62 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0509141];
R. K. Ellis and G. Zanderighi, arXiv:0712.1851 [hep-ph].

- [4] Z. Bern *et al.* [NLO Multileg Working Group], arXiv:0803.0494 [hep-ph].
- [5] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar and D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B **425**, 217 (1994) [arXiv:hep-ph/9403226].
Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar and D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B **435**, 59 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9409265].
- [6] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B **513**, 3 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9708239].
Z. Bern, V. Del Duca, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 045006 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0410224].
R. Britto, F. Cachazo and B. Feng, Nucl. Phys. B **725**, 275 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0412103].
P. Mastrolia, Phys. Lett. B **644**, 272 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0611091].
D. Forde, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 125019 (2007) [arXiv:0704.1835 [hep-ph]].
R. K. Ellis, W. T. Giele and Z. Kunszt, JHEP **0803**, 003 (2008) [arXiv:0708.2398 [hep-ph]].
W. B. Kilgore, arXiv:0711.5015 [hep-ph].
W. T. Giele, Z. Kunszt and K. Melnikov, JHEP **0804**, 049 (2008) [arXiv:0801.2237 [hep-ph]].
C. F. Berger *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 036003 (2008) [arXiv:0803.4180 [hep-ph]].
S. D. Badger, JHEP **0901**, 049 (2009) [arXiv:0806.4600 [hep-ph]].
- [7] G. Ossola, C. G. Papadopoulos and R. Pittau, Nucl. Phys. B **763**, 147 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0609007].
- [8] R. K. Ellis, W. T. Giele, Z. Kunszt and K. Melnikov, arXiv:0806.3467 [hep-ph].
- [9] W. L. van Neerven, Nucl. Phys. B **268**, 453 (1986).
- [10] R. Britto, E. Buchbinder, F. Cachazo and B. Feng, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 065012 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0503132].
R. Britto, B. Feng and P. Mastrolia, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 105004 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0602178].
C. Anastasiou, R. Britto, B. Feng, Z. Kunszt and P. Mastrolia, Phys. Lett. B **645**, 213 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0609191].
C. Anastasiou, R. Britto, B. Feng, Z. Kunszt and P. Mastrolia, JHEP **0703**, 111 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0612277].
- [11] R. Britto and B. Feng, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 105006 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0612089].
R. Britto and B. Feng, JHEP **0802**, 095 (2008) [arXiv:0711.4284 [hep-ph]].
R. Britto, B. Feng and P. Mastrolia, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 025031 (2008) [arXiv:0803.1989 [hep-ph]].
R. Britto, B. Feng and G. Yang, JHEP **0809**, 089 (2008) [arXiv:0803.3147 [hep-ph]].
- [12] F. del Aguila and R. Pittau, JHEP **0407**, 017 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0404120].
R. Pittau, arXiv:hep-ph/0406105.
- [13] S. Catani, T. Gleisberg, F. Krauss, G. Rodrigo and J. C. Winter, JHEP **0809**, 065 (2008) [arXiv:0804.3170 [hep-ph]].
- [14] E. W. N. Glover and C. Williams, JHEP **0812**, 067 (2008) [arXiv:0810.2964 [hep-th]].
- [15] Z. Bern and A. G. Morgan, Nucl. Phys. B **467**, 479 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9511336].
- [16] R. Mertig, M. Bohm and A. Denner, Comput. Phys. Commun. **64**, 345 (1991).